

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Final Office Action dated May 4, 2006, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-4, 6-8 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1 and 3 being independent. (Claims 6-8 has been added by the foregoing amendment.) Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Further, Applicant believes that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserves the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

I. Personal interview

Appreciation is expressed to Examiner Patel and Examiner Raabe for extending the courtesy of granting and conducting a personal interview on July 10, 2006 with Toshikatsu Imaizumi. That interview included a discussion of US Pre-grant Publication 2002/0705272 to Takagaki et al.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Takagaki et al. in view of Ooyama et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1 and 2

Claim 1 is directed to a short arc type high pressure discharge lamp comprising: a pair of electrodes disposed inside the discharge lamp and facing each other, a light emitting portion, a sealing portion that extends to a side of the light emitting portion, and seals part of one of the electrodes, and a metallic foil that is sealed in the sealing portion, wherein the one of the electrodes and the metallic foil are joined in the sealing portion, and wherein the metallic foil is formed in an approximately omega shape in a cross-sectional view thereof, and at least one welding trace where the metallic foil and the one of the electrodes are welded is located on a curved line of the approximately omega shape in a cross-section of the metallic foil.

On the other hand, Takagaki et al. arguably discloses an ARC tube and method for forming the same. Ooyama et al arguably discloses a high pressure mercury lamp with particular electrode structure and emission device for a high-pressure mercury lamp.

None of the applied art, alone or in combination, does disclose, teach or suggest at least one welding trace where the metallic foil and the one of the electrodes are welded is located on a curved line of the approximately omega shape in a cross-section of the metallic foil. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

As to dependent claim 2, it is respectfully submitted that since it depends on claim 1, it is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable respectively and it is further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is directed to a method of welding an electrode and a metallic foil, comprising steps of: press processing a metallic foil to form a curved surface portion so that a cross-sectional view of the metallic foil is an approximately omega shape, placing the electrode in the curved surface portion, and welding the metallic foil and the electrode at a curved surface portion of the omega shape of the metallic foil.

Similarly, none of the applied art, alone or in combination, does disclose, teach or suggest a step of welding the metallic foil and the electrode at a curved surface portion of the omega shape of the metallic foil.

Claim 4

As to dependent claim 4, it is respectfully submitted that since it depends on claim 3, it is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 3 is allowable respectively and it is further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Claim 5

Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Takagaki et al. in view of Ooyama et al. and Dixon et al.

Claim 5 has been canceled by the foregoing amendment. Therefore, the rejection is now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Newly Added Claims

By the foregoing amendment, Applicant has added claims 6-8 in order to claim various features of the invention. Since claims 6-8 depend on independent claim 1 respectively, they are allowable for at least same reasons that claim 1 is allowable respectively.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/790,099
Amendment dated July 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006


Docket No.: UDK-0017

The undersigned has been given limited recognition by the Director to prosecute as an attorney this application under 37 C.F.R. §10.9(a).

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. UDK-0017 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Toshikatsu Imaizumi

Registration No.: L0046 (Limited Recognition)

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 23353
Attorney for Applicant